



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/816,552	03/23/2001	Mark S. Igra	41017.P003	6531
25943 7590 01/18/2007 SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C. PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204				
			EXAMINER HUTTON JR, WILLIAM D	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/18/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20070111

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Acknowledgment of Reply Brief

The reply brief filed 11/13/2006 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

The examiner notes that Appellant first argued that Ferrel fails to disclose “common navigation” between the pages of the online newspaper because Ferrel fails to show *any* method of navigation (emphasis included). See *Appeal Brief* – Page 11, first full paragraph. Appellant now concedes that the online newspaper in Ferrel provides for transitions between the pages (see *Reply Brief* – Page 2, first full paragraph, fifth sentence) and submits a **new** argument that Ferrel fails to disclose a common navigation arrangement (emphasis included) (see *Reply Brief* – Page 3, second full paragraph through Page 4, first full paragraph).

The examiner also notes that Appellant submits **new** arguments that Ferrel fails to disclose subordinate content specifications that reference the templates, controls and style sheets “for style, navigation, and content placement” because:

1. the style sheets do not provide “common navigation;” (see *Reply Brief* – Page 1, third paragraph through Page 2, first full paragraph) and
2. the story objects are referenced by the controls and do not reference the controls (emphasis included) (see *Reply Brief* – Page 2, second full paragraph through Page 3, first full paragraph).

Because Appellant submits new arguments in support of the claims, the examiner responds in the following discussion.

Response to Reply Brief

Appellant's arguments filed in the Reply Brief dated 11/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Argument Section "A":

Appellant argues that Ferrel "fails to teach subordinate content specifications that reference the templates, controls, and style sheets 'for style, navigation, and content placement,'" as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis included). Appellant reasons that, while Ferrel teaches story objects referencing style sheets, such style sheets do not provide common navigation. Thus, Appellant argues, the style sheets are incapable of serving, alone, as the master specification recited in Claim 1. See *Reply Brief* – Page 1, third paragraph through Page 2, first full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The "*subordinate content specifications*" in Ferrel are the story objects that are used to provide content for the online newspaper. As admitted by Appellant, Ferrel expressly discloses that the story objects of the online newspaper reference the associated style sheets before being rendered on the page. See *Reply Brief* – Page 2, first full paragraph, fourth sentence. Ferrel also expressly discloses the style sheets may be linked to the control regions on a page. See Column 21, Lines 8-11. Thus, the style sheets are linked to the control regions in the page templates.

The "*master specification*" in Ferrel is the collection of templates used to render the pages of the online newspaper. These templates comprise the controls and the

style sheets. As expressly disclosed in Ferrel, the templates, controls and style sheets are linked in order to properly display the pages of the online newspaper. Also, as expressly disclosed in Ferrel, the story objects of the online newspaper **references** the associated style sheets before being rendered on the page. By **referencing** the associated **style sheets**, which are linked to the **corresponding templates and controls** for displaying the page, the story objects also reference the linked corresponding templates and controls.

As admitted by Appellant, the templates and controls provide the “navigation arrangement” that allows transitions between pages of the online newspaper. See *Reply Brief* – Page 2, first full paragraph, fifth sentence. Thus, by referencing the style sheets that are linked to the corresponding templates and controls which provide for navigation between the pages, the story objects reference the templates, controls, and style sheets “for style, navigation, and content placement,” as recited in Claim 1.

Appellant argues further that Ferrel “fails to teach subordinate content specifications that reference the templates, controls, and style sheets ‘for style, navigation, and content placement,’” as recited in Claim 1 (emphasis included). Appellant reasons that Ferrel fails to teach objects that reference the controls because the story objects are referenced by the controls, rather than the story objects referencing the controls (emphasis included). Appellant observes that Ferrel expressly discloses that each control delineates an area where content should be placed and that

settings on each control determines the proper place to look for the content to be displayed in that control. See *Reply Brief* – Page 2, second full paragraph through Page 3, first full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The “*subordinate content specifications*” in Ferrel are the story objects that are used to provide content for the online newspaper. As admitted by Appellant, Ferrel expressly discloses that the **story objects** of the online newspaper reference the **associated style sheets** before being rendered on the page. See *Reply Brief* – Page 2, first full paragraph, fourth sentence. Ferrel also expressly discloses the style sheets may be linked to the control regions on a page. See Column 21, Lines 8-11. Thus, the style sheets are linked to the control regions in the page templates.

The “*master specification*” in Ferrel is the collection of templates used to render the pages of the online newspaper. These templates comprise the controls and the style sheets. As expressly disclosed in Ferrel, the templates, controls and style sheets are linked in order to properly display the pages of the online newspaper. Also, as expressly disclosed in Ferrel, the story objects of the online newspaper **references** the associated style sheets before being rendered on the page. By **referencing** the associated **style sheets**, which are linked to the **corresponding templates and controls** for displaying the page, the **story objects** also reference the linked **corresponding templates and controls**.

Thus, by referencing the style sheets that are linked to the corresponding templates and controls which provide for navigation between the pages, the story

objects reference the templates, controls, and style sheets “for style, navigation, and content placement,” as recited in Claim 1.

Moreover, as admitted by Appellant in the Specification and Drawings of the present application, at the time the invention was made, the prior art included:

1. a master navigation page (*i.e.*, “*master specification*”) that contained navigation information (*i.e.*, “*common navigation arrangement*”); and
2. subordinate web pages (*i.e.*, “*subordinate content specifications*”) that **referenced** the master navigation page in order to obtain the navigation information contained therein.

See Figure 1 in the Drawings. See Page 2, Lines 14-19 in the Specification.

Argument Section “B”:

Appellant argues that Ferrel fails to disclose a master specification specifying a common navigation arrangement because, although Ferrel supports transitions between page layouts and content objects, Ferrel fails to disclose any common arrangement of these transitions (emphasis included). Appellant also observes that a “common navigation arrangement” would require that each page have the same arrangements for transitioning to other pages that every other page referencing the master specification

has. See *Reply Brief* – Page 3, second full paragraph through Page 4, first full paragraph.

The examiner disagrees.

The examiner first notes that the online newspaper disclosed in Ferrel separates the “structure” (e.g., templates, controls, style sheets) of the newspaper from the “content” (e.g., story objects) of the newspaper. See Column 6, Lines 36-49. The examiner also notes that Ferrel discloses a “common” navigation arrangement in several ways, as indicated in the following discussion.

Firstly, the online newspaper includes a “Page 1” template and a “Page 2” template for the Business Section of the newspaper. These templates give the online newspaper a distinctive “look and feel.” These templates also “support transitions” between the pages so that users can easily navigate between the different pages and sections of the newspaper. See Figure 8; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62.

Secondly, Ferrel discloses that “the last page used is repeated until all stories are rendered” whenever a section of the online newspaper does not define enough pages to display all of the stories. In that case, at least one extra page would be added to the section, and the section would support transitions between the pages so the reader could view all of the pages of the section. Stated differently, the “last page” template would be reused to produce additional pages of the online newspaper until all of the story objects are inserted into the online newspaper. This “last page” template would provide a “common navigation arrangement” for each additional page it is used to

produce so that the reader could view all of the pages of the corresponding section of the online newspaper. See Figure 8; see Column 18, Line 63 through Column 20, Line 62.

Thirdly, Ferrel discloses templates having navigational bars showing the different sections of the online newspaper. The user may click on a section to navigate to the selected section. Additionally, the templates include a "next" button that allows users to navigate to the next page of the online newspaper by clicking on the button. For every page on the online newspaper generated using the template, the navigational bar and the "next" button will be included on the page in order to provide a consistent "look and feel" for the newspaper and a "common" navigational arrangement. See Figure 6; see Column 17, Lines 29-60.

Moreover, as admitted by Appellant in the Specification and Drawings of the present application, at the time the invention was made, the prior art included:

1. a master navigation page (*i.e.*, "*master specification*") that contained navigation information (*i.e.*, "*common navigation arrangement*"); and
2. subordinate web pages (*i.e.*, "*subordinate content specifications*") that referenced the master navigation page in order to **obtain the navigation information contained therein.**

See Figure 1 in the Drawings. See Page 2, Lines 14-19 in the Specification.

Art Unit: 2176

In other words, the prior art included multiple subordinate web pages that referenced a single master navigation page in order to obtain a "common" navigational arrangement.

January 12, 2007
WDH

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Doug Hutton", with a stylized, looping flourish at the end.

Doug Hutton
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100